

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/582,945	07/07/2000	RUDOLF RITTER	PM271464	4546
7	590 05/29/2003			
Pillsbury Winthrop LLP			EXAMINER	
1600 Tysons B McLean, VA		•	D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2683	<u></u>
		•	DATE MAILED: 05/29/2003	· ·

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

O-90C (Rev. 07-01)

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/582,945	RITTER, RUDOLF	\sim
Auvisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	~~ <i>\\</i>
	Stephen M. D'Agosta	2683	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin is FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final of	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on 22 May 2	2003 is a)⊠ approved or b)□	disapproved by the	Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s		
10. Other:			
		WILLIAM CUMMING PRIMARY EXAMINER	
S Patent and Trademark Office			





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: a) considerable attention is focused on the argument that the art cited does not teach a wireless/mobile radio system. The examiner points out that the device taught by Yoshinobu can be a wireless "remote" device (eg. for a TV) as well as a telephone (figure 2, #500 and C5, L56-65). The use of the phone provides motivation for it to be either a wired or wireless phone (the examiner broadly them as being interchangeable). The applicant's specification points out that wireless video phones are known in the art, hence one would use said video phone in place of Yoshinobu's phone (#500) {IDS provided by the applicant but not cited (Koen et al.) also teaches use of a phone for establishing a link between subscriber and broadcast stations). b) with regard to use of SIM card, both Johnstromer (and IDS provided by applicant but not cited (Martineau et al.) teach use of a SIM card for communications which reads on the claim. The ability to receive and reproduce broadcast data is available per a videophone per the applicant (page 4, L19-29) who states that one skilled in the art can "easily can easily integrate a TV tuner in such as mobile videophone). Hence no separate TV would be required. c) with regard to instantaneous confirming of actions, this is taught by Diehl and reads on the claim(s). d) with regard to Suzuki and Alperovich arguments, the examiner stands on his rejection since all requirements of the claim are disclosed by Suzuki/Alperovich (in combination with other art).